



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/447,227	11/22/1999	MARK C. SHULTS	DEXCOM.008DV1	3546
20995 7590 07/17/2007 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
			EXAMINER NASSER, ROBERT L	
			ART UNIT 3735	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/447,227

Applicant(s)

SHULTS ET AL

Examiner

Robert L. Nasser

Art Unit

3735

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, 48, 49 and 54-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, 48, 49, 54-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims 41 and 42 are objected to in that there is no antecedent basis for the implant.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, and 54-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gough et al 5985129 in view of Picha 5271736. Gough et al shows a wholly implantable glucose sensing method including wholly implanting a device in a host, where the device provides continuous glucose sensing and comprises a housing 10 having a protruding convexly curved portion (to the right in the figure) that has a different curvature than the housing, and a sensing membrane 16 on the tip of the protruding portion. It does not have the first domain. However, Picha teaches that it is known to encase an implanted sensor in a layer that is angiogenic or promotes vascularization, to enhance the measurement process, as described in columns 5 and 6. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Gough to use such a layer, to improve the measurement process. Claim 42 is rejected in that the device telemetrically communicates data (see column 5, lines 60-65). Claims 54 and 55 are rejected in that there is an electrolytic phase 12. . With respect to claims 56-58 and 62, it is the examiner's position that given that the device of the combination has an angiogenic or vascular promoting layer, it would measure glucose accurately for the claimed time

Art Unit: 3735

periods. With respect to claims 59-61, applicant has admitted that it is known to explant the device when the useful life of the device is over. Claim 63 is rejected in that the foam of Picha is a silicone elastomer (see column 3, line 61). Claim 65 is rejected in that the device is an enzymatic sensor (see column 9, lines 5-10). With respect to claims 66-69 the examiner takes official notice that all of the sensors recited are known glucose sensors. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Allen to use any of the recited sensors, as it is merely the substitution of one known equivalent sensor for another. Claims 70-83 are rejected for the reasons given above.

Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gough et al in view of Picha, as applied to claims 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, and 54-83 above, and further in view of the Gilligan et al article entitled "Evaluation of a subcutaneous glucose model out to . . . Gilligan further teaches using an enzyme membrane in a glucose sensor. As such, it would have been obvious to modify the combination to use an enzyme membrane, as it is merely the substitution of one equivalent sensor for another. In addition, the examiner takes official notice that glucose oxidase is well known and hence obvious to use in a glucose sensor as the enzyme.

Applicant's arguments filed 5/2/2007 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pfeiffer et al 5640954 shows a partially implanted device with a housing 18 and a concave protrusion 50 with a different curvature than the housing.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is 571 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3735

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert L. Nasser  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3735

RLN  
July 7, 2007

  
